

cf/100/1- (u)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR

W.P. NO. 1742 OF 2002

IN THE MATTER OF:-

1. M/S HEG LIMITED, a company duly incorporated under the relevant provisions of the Companies Act, 1956, having its registered office at Mandideep Distt. Raisen (M.P.) and a Sponge Iron and Captive Power Plant at Industrial Growth Centre, Borai, P.O. Rasmada - 491 009, Distt. Durg (C.G.)

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

1. CHHATTISGARH STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LIMITED, (a Govt. of Chhattisgarh undertaking) formerly known as M.P. Audyogik Kendra Vikas Nigam (Raipur) Ltd., having its Head Office at B-4, M.R. Colony, Shailendra Nagar, Raipur (C.G.) 492 001.
2. The State of Chhattisgarh through the Principal Secretary to the Govt. of Chhattisgarh, Department of Commerce, and Industries, Mantralaya (D.K. Bhawan) G.E.Road, Raipur(C.G.)

P.R. No. 1245/02

Prepared by Shri. A. P. Shetty
dated 26.8.02

...Respondents

PETITION UNDER ARTICLES 226/227 OF THE
CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR THE ISSUANCE OF WRITS
IN THE NATURE OF MANDAMUS, CERTIORARI, ETC. ETC.
AND/OR FOR ORDER (S) AND/OR FOR DIRECTION(S) IN
THE NATURE OF WRITS

b

120

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

Writ Petition No. 1742 of 2002

Petitioner

M/s HEG LIMITED

Versus

Respondents

Chhattisgarh State Industrial
Development Corporation Ltd. &
another

Single Bench : Hon'ble Mr. Justice Satish K. Agnihotri.

Shri B. P. Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Smt. Smita Ghai, Advocate for the respondent No. 1.

Shri Sunil Otwani, Panel lawyer for the respondent No. 2.

ORAL ORDER

(12th May, 2006)

The following order of the Court was passed by **Satish K. Agnihotri, J.**

1. On being mentioned, this I.A.No. 50017/2006, application for withdrawal of the petition is taken on record. Learned counsel for the petitioner, on instruction, submits that the petitioner does not want to pursue this matter and seeks to withdraw the petition. Learned counsels for the respondents have no objection, if the application is entertained and considered.
2. In view of the averments made in the application, this application is ordered, as prayed for.
3. Consequently, the petition is dismissed as withdrawn.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge